

Exclusive vector meson production at high energies and gluon saturation

Néstor Armesto¹ and Amir H. Rezaeian^{2,3}

¹ *Departamento de Física de Partículas and IGFAE,
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 15782 Santiago de Compostela, Galicia, Spain*

² *Departamento de Física, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María,
Avda. España 1680, Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile*

³ *Centro Científico Tecnológico de Valparaíso (CCTVal),
Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile*

We investigate exclusive diffractive photoproduction of vector mesons (J/ψ , ϕ and ρ) off protons in high-energy collisions. We confront saturation-based results for diffractive J/ψ photoproduction with all available data including recent ones from HERA and LHCb. We show that while the total J/ψ cross-section is affected by uncertainties related to the charm mass, the t -distribution of differential cross-section offers a unique opportunity to unambiguously discriminate among saturation and non-saturation models. This is due to emergence of a pronounced dip (or multiple dips) in the t -distribution of diffractive photoproduction of vector mesons at relatively large $|t|$ that can be traced back to the unitarity features of colour dipole amplitude in the saturation regime. We show that in saturation models the dip in the t -distribution recedes towards lower $|t|$ with decreasing mass of the vector meson, increasing energy or decreasing Bjorken- x , and decreasing virtuality Q . We provide predictions for exclusive photoproduction of various vector mesons at the LHC and at future electron-proton colliders.

I. INTRODUCTION

There is strong theoretical evidence that Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) at high-energy (or small Bjorken- x) leads to a non-linear regime where gluon recombination or unitarity effects become important [1, 2], resulting in saturation of parton densities in hadrons and nuclei. The quest for experimental evidence of possible signature of gluon saturation phenomenon has been the program of various past or existing experiments from HERA and RHIC to the LHC, and future experiments such as an Electron-Ion Collider (EIC) [3] and the LHeC [4]. Nevertheless, experimental evidence that can unarguably point towards gluon saturation phenomenon, has been elusive so far. This is because the experiments currently at our disposal are limited in their kinematic coverage, and often other approaches provide alternative descriptions of the same sets of data.

An effective field theory approach that describes the high-energy limit of QCD is the Colour Glass Condensate (CGC) [2]. In this formalism, the standard quantum evolution equations (with large logarithms of $1/x$ resummed), lead to a situation in which the occupancy of the slow modes in the hadron is so high than they can be treated classically, with the fast modes considered as sources. The corresponding renormalisation group equations, known in the limit of scattering of a dilute probe on a dense hadron, are the so-called Jalilian-Marian-Iancu-McLerran-Weigert-Leonidov-Kovner (JIMWLK) hierarchy of equations [5] or, in the large N_c limit, the Balitsky-Kovchegov (BK) equation [6], presently known to next-to-leading accuracy [7, 8].

One of the most crucial tests of the CGC (or saturation) approach has been its success in the description of the highly precise combined data of the proton structure at HERA [9–11] alongside with data from exclusive diffractive processes in electron-proton collisions, such as exclusive vector meson production and deeply virtual Compton Scattering (DVCS) [10, 11]. Nevertheless, the standard DGLAP-type approaches - without inclusion of any saturation effect - give an equally good description of the same data. While the CGC description can be considered more economic due to the use of a significantly smaller number of fitting parameters, it is limited to small- x data and restricted to the gluon sector. On the other hand, in addition to DIS and diffractive processes [9–15], within the CGC framework it is also possible to simultaneously describe other high-energy hadronic interactions in a regime not currently accessible to approaches that rely on collinear factorization. For example, in proton-proton [16] and nuclear collisions [17–21] several observables have been successfully addressed: single inclusive hadron [22–27] and prompt photon [24, 28] production, and semi-inclusive photon-hadron [28, 29] and dihadron [30] productions. For a recent review, see Ref. [31] and references therein.

Exclusive diffractive vector meson production provides a rich testing ground of many QCD novel properties [10–15, 32–37]. In particular, by measuring the squared momentum transfer t , one can study the transverse spatial distribution of the gluons in the hadron wave function that cannot be probed in inclusive DIS. In this

respect, new experimental measurements are under way. The LHCb collaboration has recently released new data on J/ψ photoproduction with photon-proton center-of-mass energies upto about 1.3 TeV [38], the highest energy ever measured so far in this kind of reaction. Alongside this, the H1 collaboration also recently reported some new data for J/ψ with improved precision [39]. On the other hand, the recently released high-precision combined HERA data [40, 41] that were not available at the time of previous studies of diffractive processes [3, 4, 12–14, 42], provide extra important constraints on saturation models [10, 11].

In this work, we analyse these new data on exclusive photoproduction of vector mesons off the proton and provide predictions for the kinematics accessible in future experiments. We show that the freedom to choose the charm mass in the range consistent with global analysis of inclusive observables, results in sizeable uncertainties for the total cross-section of elastic photoproduction of vector mesons that may compromise the ability of this observable to distinguish among models. However, we find that the corresponding t -distributions of differential cross-section may unambiguously discriminate among saturation and non-saturation models. This is due to emergence of a pronounced dip (or multiple dips) in the t -distribution of diffractive photoproduction of vector mesons at relatively large $|t|$ which is directly related to saturation physics.

This paper is organised as follows. In section II, we introduce the formulation of the colour dipole approach for calculating exclusive diffractive processes, discussing also the IP-Sat and the b-CGC dipole models. In section III, we present a detailed numerical analysis and our main results. We also discuss the origin of the dips in the t -distribution of diffractive photoproduction of vector mesons and provide predictions for future experiments. We summarise our main results in section IV.

II. EXCLUSIVE DIFFRACTIVE PROCESSES IN THE COLOUR-DIPOLE FORMALISM

In the colour dipole formalism, the underlying mechanism for diffractive production of different vector mesons and for inclusive DIS is similar. Namely, one must calculate the probability for finding a colour dipole of transverse size r with impact parameter b in the wave function of a (real or virtual) photon or of a vector meson. Similar to the case of the inclusive DIS process, the scattering amplitude for the exclusive diffractive process $\gamma^* + p \rightarrow V + p$, with a final-state vector meson $V = J/\psi, \phi, \rho$ (or a real photon $V = \gamma$ in DVCS), can be written in terms of a convolution of the dipole amplitude $\mathcal{N}$ and the overlap of the wave functions of the photon and the exclusive final-state particle (see [10, 11, 13] and references therein),

$$\mathcal{A}_{T,L}^{\gamma^* p \rightarrow V p} = 2i \int d^2 \mathbf{r} \int d^2 \mathbf{b} \int_0^1 dz (\Psi_V^* \Psi)_{T,L}(r, z, m_f, M_V; Q^2) e^{-i[\mathbf{b} - (1-z)\mathbf{r}] \cdot \mathbf{\Delta}} \mathcal{N}(x, r, b), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{\Delta}^2 = -t$ with t being the squared momentum transfer. In this equation, $\mathcal{N}$ is the imaginary part of the forward $q\bar{q}$ dipole-proton scattering amplitude with transverse dipole size r and impact parameter b . The parameter z is the fraction of the light cone momentum of the virtual photon carried by the quark and m_f denotes the mass of the quark with flavour f . The above expression can be understood in light front time as distinct chronological subprocesses, namely first the γ^* fluctuates into a quark-antiquark pair (the so-called colour $q\bar{q}$ -dipole) which then interacts with the target; finally the $q\bar{q}$ pair recombines to form the final-state vector meson. In Eq. (1) summations over the quark helicities and over the quark flavor $f = u, d, s, c$ are implicit. The phase factor $\exp(i(1-z)\mathbf{r} \cdot \mathbf{\Delta})$ in the above equation is due to the non-forward wave-function contribution [43]. The explicit form of the overlap wave functions $(\Psi_V^* \Psi)_{T,L}$ with L, T denoting the longitudinal and transverse polarisations, can be found in Ref. [13].

Following Refs. [10, 11, 13], here we use the boosted Gaussian wave-functions [44] which were found to provide a very good description of exclusive diffractive HERA data [10, 11, 13]. The parameters of the overlap wave-functions were already determined by a fit to other reactions, mainly to experimentally measured leptonic decay widths of vector mesons for the longitudinally polarised case [13]. For vector meson production, the dipole amplitude in Eq. (1) is evaluated at $x = x_{Bj} (1 + M_V^2/Q^2)$, where M_V denotes the mass of the vector meson¹ and x_{Bj} is Bjorken- x .

¹ At $Q^2 = 0$, we have $x = M_V^2/(W_{\gamma p}^2 - M_N^2)$ where M_N denotes the nucleon mass and $W_{\gamma p}$ is the centre-of-mass energy of the photon-proton system.

The differential cross-section of the exclusive diffractive processes can then be written in terms of the scattering amplitude as [11, 13, 14],

$$\frac{d\sigma_{T,L}^{\gamma^*p \rightarrow Vp}}{dt} = \frac{1}{16\pi} \left| \mathcal{A}_{T,L}^{\gamma^*p \rightarrow Vp} \right|^2 (1 + \beta^2) R_g^2, \quad (2)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= \tan\left(\frac{\pi\delta}{2}\right), \\ R_g(\delta) &= \frac{2^{2\delta+3}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{\Gamma(\delta + 5/2)}{\Gamma(\delta + 4)}, \\ \delta &\equiv \frac{\partial \ln(\mathcal{A}_{T,L}^{\gamma^*p \rightarrow Vp})}{\partial \ln(1/x)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the factor $(1 + \beta^2)$ takes into account the missing real part of amplitude (notice that the amplitude in Eq. (1) is purely imaginary), with β the ratio of the real to imaginary parts of the scattering amplitude [10, 11, 13]. The factor R_g incorporates the skewness effect, coming from the fact that the gluons attached to the $q\bar{q}$ can carry different light-front fractions x, x' of the proton [45, 46]. The skewedness factor given in Eq. (3) was obtained at NLO level, in the limit that $x' \ll x \ll 1$ and at small t assuming that the diagonal gluon density of target has a power-law form [45]. Note that there are uncertainties with respect to the actual incorporation of the skewness correction at small x in dipole models² [47]. However, these uncertainties will not affect our main results and conclusions here.

The common ingredient of the total (and reduced) cross-sections (i.e. for the proton structure functions in DIS) and exclusive diffractive vector meson production, is the universal $q\bar{q}$ dipole-proton forward scattering amplitude. Although the impact-parameter dependence of the dipole amplitude is less important for inclusive processes, it is crucial for describing exclusive diffractive ones. Note that the impact-parameter profile of the dipole amplitude entails intrinsically non-perturbative physics, which is beyond the QCD weak-coupling approach to small- x physics [48–50]. Therefore, the impact-parameter dependence of the dipole amplitude, unfortunately, can only be treated phenomenologically up to now. Supported by experimental data, it is generally assumed a Gaussian profile for gluons where the width of the profile, as only free parameter, is fixed via a fit to diffractive data at HERA. We use two well-known impact-parameter dependent saturation models, the so-called IP-Sat [10, 12] and b-CGC [11, 14] models which both have been very successful in phenomenological applications from HERA to RHIC and the LHC.

In the IP-Sat model [12], the proton-dipole forward scattering amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(x, r, b) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2 r^2}{2N_c} \alpha_s(\mu^2) xg(x, \mu^2) T_G(b)\right), \quad (4)$$

$$T_G(b) = \frac{1}{2\pi B_G} \exp(-b^2/2B_G), \quad (5)$$

where $T_G(b)$ is the gluon impact-parameter profile and $xg(x, \mu^2)$ is the gluon density, evolved with dipole transverse size r up to the scale $\mu^2 = 4/r^2 + \mu_0^2$ with LO DGLAP gluon evolution (neglecting its coupling to quarks) with initial gluon distribution at the scale μ_0^2

$$xg(x, \mu_0^2) = A_g x^{-\lambda_g} (1-x)^{5.6}. \quad (6)$$

We take the corresponding one-loop running-coupling value of α_s for four flavours, with $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = 0.156$ GeV fixed by the experimentally measured value of α_s at the Z^0 mass. The contribution from bottom quarks is neglected. The IP-Sat dipole amplitude can be derived at the classical level in the CGC [2]. Through eikonalization

² Note that in the IP-Sat model [10], the skewness effect can be simply incorporated by multiplying the gluon distribution $xg(x, \mu^2)$ by a factor $R_g(\gamma)$ with $\gamma \equiv \frac{\partial \ln[xg(x, \mu^2)]}{\partial \ln(1/x)}$. This is consistent with the prescription given in Eqs. (2, 3) [11].

it explicitly maintains unitarity while matching smoothly the high Q^2 perturbative QCD limit via DGLAP evolution. The eikonalization of the gluon distribution in the IP-Sat model represents a resummation of higher twist contributions which become important at small x . The first term of the expansion of the exponential in Eq. (4) corresponds to the leading-order pQCD expansion for the dipole amplitude in the colour-transparency region, as opposed to the saturation case, and it is here called the 1-Pomeron model.

In the b-CGC dipole model [14], the colour dipole-proton forward scattering amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{N}(x, r, b) = \begin{cases} N_0 \left(\frac{rQ_s}{2} \right)^{2\gamma_{eff}} & \text{for } rQ_s \leq 2, \\ 1 - \exp(-\mathcal{A} \ln^2(\mathcal{B}rQ_s)) & \text{for } rQ_s > 2, \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where the effective anomalous dimension γ_{eff} and the saturation scale Q_s of the proton explicitly depend on the impact parameter and are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{eff} &= \gamma_s + \frac{1}{\kappa \lambda Y} \ln \left(\frac{2}{rQ_s} \right), \\ Q_s \equiv Q_s(x, b) &= \left(\frac{x_0}{x} \right)^{\frac{\lambda}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{b^2}{4\gamma_s B_{CGC}} \right\} \text{GeV}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $Y = \ln(1/x)$ and $\kappa = \chi''(\gamma_s)/\chi'(\gamma_s)$, with χ being the LO BFKL characteristic function. The parameters $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ in Eq. (7) are determined uniquely from the matching of the dipole amplitude and its logarithmic derivatives at $rQ_s = 2$. The b-CGC model is constructed by smoothly interpolating between two analytically known limiting cases [51], namely the solution of the BFKL equation in the vicinity of the saturation line for small dipole sizes, and the solution of the BK equation deep inside the saturation region for large dipole sizes [52, 53].

Although both the b-CGC and the IP-Sat models include saturation effects and depend on impact-parameter, the underlying dynamics of two models is quite different, namely saturation in the b-CGC and the IP-Sat models is probed through the increase of the gluon density (in the dilute regimes) driven by BFKL and DGLAP evolutions, respectively.

The parameters of the dipole amplitudes in the IP-Sat (μ_0, A_g, λ_g) and b-CGC ($N_0, \gamma_s, x_0, \lambda$) models were determined via a fit to the recent combined HERA data for the reduced cross-sections [40, 41] in the range $Q^2 \in [0.75, 650] \text{ GeV}^2$ and $x \leq 0.01$. The widths of the impact-parameter profiles, B_G and B_{CGC} in the IP-Sat and the b-CGC models respectively, were iteratively fixed to give a good description of the t -dependence of exclusive diffractive J/ψ production at HERA (at small- t where data lie), while at the same time this consistently fixes the normalization of the inclusive reduced cross-section without further adjustment and give an excellent description of all other diffractive data (for different vector mesons and DVCS production) at small x [10, 11]. The values of parameters of the models can be found in Refs. [10, 11]. Note that in both the IP-Sat and the b-CGC models, the fit to the recent combined HERA data at $x \leq 0.01$ becomes stable for $Q^2 \geq Q_{min}^2 = 0.75 \text{ GeV}^2$; one observes a steady increase in χ^2 with decreasing values of Q_{min}^2 [10, 11]. Therefore, our photoproduction results at $Q \approx 0$ may be considered as a test of the model beyond the kinematics where it was fitted. But the generic features of our results there, are expected not to be affected by this extrapolation.

We stress again that in the master equations (1), (2), (3), the small- x dynamics encoded in the dipole amplitude $\mathcal{N}(x, r, b)$, including its impact-parameter dependence, is the same for different vector mesons $J/\psi, \phi, \rho$ and for DVCS, while the overlap wave functions between the photon and the vector mesons $\Psi_V^* \Psi$, control the typical transverse dipole size which contributes at a given kinematics.

III. MAIN NUMERICAL RESULTS AND PREDICTIONS

We first focus on the total cross-section of elastic diffractive photoproduction of J/ψ as a function of centre-of-mass energy of the photon-proton system $W_{\gamma p}$. The advantage of the J/ψ over other vector mesons is that because of its large mass, the calculation both for the cross-section and the overlap wave function are under better theoretical control and can be treated perturbatively. In Fig. 1, we compare the results obtained for the total J/ψ cross-section using the IP-Sat and the b-CGC dipole models with a fixed charm mass $m_c = 1.27 \text{ GeV}$.




FIG. 1: Total J/ψ cross-section as a function of $W_{\gamma p}$, compared to results from the b-CGC and the IP-Sat models with parameters of the models determined via a fit to the recent combined data from HERA [10, 11] and the old F_2 structure function [14] (dashed-dotted line, labeled b-CGC 2008). The data are from fixed target experiments [54], the H1, ZEUS [39, 55–57] and LHCb [38] collaborations. We also show the LHeC pseudo-data obtained from a simulation [4].

Both models with parameters extracted via a fit to the recent combined HERA data [10, 11], give consistent results with the LHCb data [38]. However, the b-CGC model with the parameters extracted via a fit to the old data (F_2 structure function) [14], underestimates the recent LHCb data. The results obtained from the b-CGC and the IP-Sat models are slightly different at very high energies due to the fact the power-law behaviour of the saturation scale in these two models is different [11].

In Fig. 2, we compare the results obtained from saturation models and pQCD approach at LO and NLO [58] with all available data from the fixed target experiments to the recent data from the H1 and LHCb collaborations³ [38, 39, 54–57]. The band labeled “CGC” includes the saturation results obtained from the IP-Sat and the b-CGC models with the parameters of models constrained by the recent combined HERA data. Note that the LHCb data points in Fig. 2 were not used for fixing the model parameters, and therefore our CGC results in Fig. 2 at high energy can be considered as predictions. Note that diffractive J/ψ production is sensitive to the charm quark mass at low Q^2 . This is because the scale in the integrand of the cross-section is set by the charm quark mass for low virtualities $Q^2 < m_c^2$. The CGC band in Fig. 2 also includes the uncertainties associated with choosing the charm mass within the range $m_c = 1.2 \div 1.4$ GeV extracted from a global analysis of existing data at small- x $x < 0.01$ [10, 11].

In Fig. 3, we show the charm-mass dependence of the total J/ψ cross-section as a function of $W_{\gamma p}$. Within the saturation models, a lower charm mass about $m_c \approx 1.2$ GeV is preferred. However, in the non-saturation version of the IP-Sat model (1-Pomeron), a larger charm mass about $m_c \approx 1.4$ GeV provides a better agreement with experimental data (see the right panel of that figure). Therefore, with only current experimental data for the total photoproduction of J/ψ cross-section, it is not possible to clearly distinguish between the saturation and non-saturation models given the rather large uncertainties associated with our freedom in choosing the charm mass. Therefore, in order to discriminate among models one should first more accurately determine

³ For the purpose of illustrating the precision that could be achieved in future experiments, both in Fig. 1 and in Fig. 2 we also show the LHeC pseudo-data obtained from a simulation [4] based on a power-law extrapolation of HERA data.




FIG. 2: Total J/ψ cross-section as a function of $W_{\gamma p}$, compared to results from the CGC/Saturation (orange band) calculated from the b-CGC and the IP-Sat models [10, 11]. The CGC band includes the uncertainties associated with our freedom to choose the charm mass within the range $m_c = 1.2 \div 1.4$ GeV. The results of pQCD fits at LO and NLO [58] are also shown. The experimental data are the same as in Fig. 1.

it. This can be done by precise measurements of the charm structure function F_2^c or reduced cross-section for charm production in a wider range of kinematics, including at small virtualities, than those currently available at HERA (restricted to $Q^2 \geq 2.5 \text{ GeV}^2$ and $x \geq 3 \times 10^{-5}$ [41]). Such measurements can be in principle done in the future LHeC experiment [4].

In Fig. 4, left panel, we compare the saturation and non-saturation models results for the t -distribution of exclusive photoproduction of J/ψ at $Q \approx 0$ with available data from HERA. It can be observed that at low $|t|$ where currently experimental data are available, one cannot discriminate between the saturation and non-saturation (1-Pomeron) models and all three models: IP-Sat, b-CGC and 1-Pomeron, provide a good description. However, at large $|t|$ the models give drastically different results, namely both the IP-Sat and the b-CGC saturation models produce a dip while the 1-pomeron model does not. In Fig. 4, right panel, we show the charm-mass dependence of the t -distribution of exclusive J/ψ photoproduction. The appearance and position of the dip are only slightly affected by the choice of charm mass. Therefore, in this respect, theoretical uncertainties due to the charm mass are less important for the t -distribution than for the total cross-section.

In Fig. 5, we show our predictions for the t -distribution of exclusive J/ψ photoproduction at LHC/LHeC energies $W_{\gamma p} = 1, 5 \text{ TeV}$ at two virtualities $Q^2 = 0, 10 \text{ GeV}^2$ obtained from the IP-Sat (saturation) and the 1-Pomeron models. In the saturation model, the dip shifts to smaller values of $|t|$ for smaller Q and for higher $W_{\gamma p}$. Note that saturation effects are expected to become more important at low virtualities and high energies.

In Fig. 6, we compare the results obtained from the IP-Sat and the b-CGC models with those from the 1-Pomeron model, for the t -distribution of the elastic photoproduction of vector mesons J/ψ , ϕ and ρ off the proton at an energy accessible at the LHC/LHeC, $W_{\gamma p} = 1 \text{ TeV}$, for $Q = 0$. Drastic different patterns for the diffractive t -distribution also emerge between saturation and non-saturation models for lighter vector mesons production such as ρ and ϕ , with the appearance of multiple dips. Note that the prospects at the LHeC [4] indicate that access to values of $|t|$ around 2 GeV^2 , required to observe the dips for J/ψ , is challenging. On the other hand, the accuracy that can be expected at lower $|t|$ should allow to observe the bending of the distributions. And lower values of $|t|$ for lighter vector mesons should be clearly accessible, probably even at




FIG. 3: Left: Total J/ψ cross-section as a function of $W_{\gamma p}$, compared to results from the IP-Sat model with different charm mass m_c . Right: Total J/ψ cross-section as a function of $W_{\gamma p}$, compared to the results from the IP-Sat (saturation) and 1-Pomeron models with different charm mass m_c . The experimental data are the same as in Fig. 1.




FIG. 4: Left: Differential vector meson cross-sections for J/ψ , as a function of $|t|$ within the IP-Sat, the b-CGC and the 1-Pomeron models with a fixed $m_c = 1.27$ GeV at HERA. Right: Results obtained from the IP-Sat and the 1-Pomeron models are compared for two values of the charm mass $m_c = 1.27, 1.4$ GeV. The experimental data are from the H1 collaboration [39, 57].

the EIC [3] but for smaller $W_{\gamma p}$.

The emergence of a single or multiple dips in the t -distribution of the vector mesons in the saturation models is directly related to the saturation (unitarity) features of the dipole scattering amplitude $\mathcal{N}$ at large dipole sizes. In order to see more clearly this effect, let us define a t -distribution of the dipole amplitude in the following




FIG. 5: Differential J/ψ cross-section, as a function of $|t|$ within the IP-Sat (saturation) and the IP-Sat (1-Pomeron) models with a fixed $m_c = 1.27$ GeV at LHC/LHeC energies $W_{\gamma p} = 1, 5$ TeV and $Q^2 = 0, 10$ GeV².




FIG. 6: Differential diffractive vector meson photoproduction cross-sections for $J/\psi, \phi, \rho$, as a function of $|t|$ within the IP-Sat (saturation), the b-CGC and the 1-Pomeron models at a fixed $W_{\gamma p} = 1$ TeV and $Q = 0$. The thickness of points includes the uncertainties associated with our freedom to choose different values for the charm quark mass within the range $m_c \approx 1.2 \div 1.4$ GeV.

way:

$$\frac{d\sigma^{\text{dipole}}}{dt} = 2\pi \left| \int_0^{\Lambda_r} r dr \int d^2b e^{-i\mathbf{b} \cdot \Delta} \mathcal{N}(x, r, b) \right|^2, \quad (9)$$

where Λ_r is an upper bound on the dipole size. The above expression is in fact very similar to Eqs. (1), (2), see also Ref. [12]. Note that in Eq. (1), the overlap of photon and vector meson wave functions gives the probability for finding a colour dipole of transverse size r in the vector meson wave function and it naturally gives rise to an implicit dynamical cutoff Λ_r which varies with kinematics and the mass of the vector meson. The cutoff Λ_r is larger at lower virtualities and for lighter vector mesons. On the other hand, quantum evolution leads to unitarity constraints on the amplitude at lower dipole sizes with decreasing values of x or increasing energies. Thus, by varying the cutoff Λ_r , one probes different regimes of the dipole from colour transparency to the saturation regime.

In the 1-Pomeron model, since the impact-parameter profile of the dipole amplitude is a Gaussian for all values of r , its Fourier transform becomes exponential for all values of t irrespective of the value of the cut-off.




FIG. 7: Left: The t -distribution of dipole amplitude defined in Eq. (9) with different values of cutoff on dipole transverse-size Λ_r in the IP-Sat (saturation) and the IP-Sat (1-Pomeron) models at a fixed $x = 10^{-6}$. Right: The dipole amplitude in different models as a function of dipole size r at $x = 10^{-6}$ for two values of impact parameter $b = 0, 3 \text{ GeV}^{-1}$.

For low Λ_r , the integrand in Eq. (9) is in the colour transparency regime (or the 1-Pomeron limit of the IP-Sat model), and the b -dependence of the amplitude is Gaussian and consequently its Fourier transform is exponential for all values of t . However, in a case with a large cutoff Λ_r , the typical dipole size which contributes to the integral is within the unitarity or black-disc limit, see e.g. [59], with $\mathcal{N} \rightarrow 1$ (see Fig. 7 right panel). Then, the Fourier transform of the dipole amplitude leads to a dip or multi-dips, as seen in Fig. 7 (left panel). The saturation effect becomes more important at smaller Bjorken- x or larger $W_{\gamma p}$, and lower virtualities Q where the contribution of large dipole sizes becomes more important, leading to a large effective Λ_r and consequently to the dip-type structure. For lighter vector mesons, the overlap extends to larger dipole sizes resulting in a dip structure as seen in Figs. 6, 7.

It is important to note that the main difference between a dipole model with linear and non-linear evolution (incorporating saturation effects) is that the former does not lead to the black-disc limit and, therefore, the dips do not systematically shift toward lower $|t|$ by increasing $W_{\gamma p}$, $1/x$, and r or $1/Q$, while the latter does. Non-linear evolution evolves any realistic profile in b , like a Gaussian or Woods-Saxon distribution, and makes it closer to a step-like function in the b -space by allowing an increase in the periphery of the hadron (the dilute region) while limiting the growth in the denser centre, see Fig. 8 for illustration. This leads to the appearance of dips with non-linear evolution even if the dips were not present at the initial condition at low energies or for large x (e.g. a Gaussian profile), or to the receding of dips towards lower values of $|t|$ even if they were already present in the initial condition (e.g. with a Woods-Saxon type profile). In Fig. 8, we show the evolution of the effective impact-parameter profile of the dipole amplitude defined as $T^{\text{eff}}(b) = \mathcal{N}(x, r, b)/\sigma^{\text{dipole}}(x, r)$ with x and r in different models. It is clearly seen that in the saturation models, by increasing $1/x$ or r , the effective impact-parameter profile $T^{\text{eff}}(b)$ naturally evolves towards a step-like function with a dynamical median extended to a larger b while, in contrast, in the 1-Pomeron dipole model $T^{\text{eff}}(b)$ does not change with r and x . Note that the typical impact-parameter of collisions is approximately related to the inverse of $|t|$, namely $|t| \propto 1/b$, see Eqs. (1), (2) or Eq. (9). Now, at small $|t|$, the typical collisions are mostly peripheral and the system is in the dilute regime with a Gaussian profile. Therefore, saturation effects become less relevant, and there will be no dip in the t -distribution. On the other hand, at large $|t|$ the typical collisions are central, and interactions probe the high-density region of the target proton. Then saturation effects become important and distort the impact-parameter profile leading to diffractive dips.




FIG. 8: Effective impact-parameter profile of the dipole amplitude defined as $T^{eff}(b) = \mathcal{N}(x, r, b) / \sigma^{dipole}(x, r)$ in different models as a function of impact-parameter b , for a fixed value of x and two different values of dipole transverse size r (left panel), and for a fixed r and two different values of x (right panel).

IV. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated the exclusive production of vector mesons in high-energy collisions. We showed that while the total photoproduction cross-section may not uniquely discriminate among models due to its large sensitivity to the uncertainties associated to the charm mass, the t -differential cross-section offers a unique opportunity to probe the saturation regime. We extended previous studies [12] by using saturation models fitted to the most recent inclusive DIS data and including in our analysis the recent experimental diffractive data from the LHCb collaboration [38] and the combined HERA analysis [40, 41]. We quantified some theoretical uncertainties and showed that the appearance of a dip or dipoles in the diffractive t -distribution of the different vector mesons (J/ψ , ϕ , ρ) is a robust prediction of the saturation picture. However, the position of the dip is presently rather model dependent, see Fig. 4. This is mainly due to the fact that the appearance of dipoles probes the dipole scattering amplitude at large dipole sizes in the saturation regime, where current available data at small x do not constrain sufficiently the dipole models [11, 31]. On the positive side, future experimental data, in particular at the LHeC, on the energy and t diffractive distributions of different vector mesons production off protons, will provide valuable constraints on saturation models and allow to unravel the relevance of non-linear effects in the accessible kinematic region.

We recall that the t -distribution of all three vector mesons (J/ψ , ϕ , ρ), as well as DVCS, at HERA, can be correctly reproduced by fixing the impact-parameter profile of the colour dipole amplitude at small $|t|$, despite the fact that the vector meson and DVCS wave functions are very different [10, 11]. This strongly hints at universality of the extracted impact-parameter distribution of gluons in the periphery of the proton. On the other hand, at large $|t|$ where we do not have currently experimental data, one can probe the transverse spatial distribution of gluons in the centre of the proton where the black-disc limit could be at work. Therefore, the t -distribution of diffractive vector mesons would provide most important information on the relevance of saturation dynamics. Besides, the impact parameter distribution of gluons in protons and nuclei (a natural extension of our work that can be explored in electron-nucleus colliders [3, 4], see also [59–61]) is a crucial ingredient for a detailed characterisation of the initial conditions in heavy ion collisions. Note that the effects of fluctuations and correlations in the proton are not incorporated into our formulation. This is an important issue that certainly deserves separate studies.

Finally, note that diffractive dipoles in the t -distribution were also observed in elastic hadronic reactions [62, 63]. However, it remains to be understood whether the origin of the dipoles in elastic hadronic reactions and diffractive

DIS is the same. In contrast to diffractive DIS, the differential cross-section of elastic proton-proton collisions is not currently computable in the weak coupling regime due to the absence of a large scale, and often some phenomenological models are employed (for a review see Ref. [64]). Nevertheless, in both cases, multiple parton interactions or multiple Pomeron exchanges seem to play an important role in the appearance of dips in the t -distribution, see e.g. [65, 66].

Acknowledgments

We thank Jorge Dias de Deus, Edmond Iancu, Paul Laycock and Genya Levin for useful discussions. The work of NA is supported by the European Research Council grant HotLHC ERC-2011-StG-279579; by the People Programme (Marie Curie Actions) of the European Union Seventh Framework Programme FP7/2007-2013/ under REA grant agreement n318921; by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of Spain under project FPA2011-22776; by Xunta de Galicia (Consellería de Educación and Consellería de Innovación e Industria - Programa Incite); and by the Spanish Consolider-Ingenio 2010 Programme CPAN and FEDER. The work of AHR is supported in part by Fondecyt grant 1110781.

-
- [1] L. V. Gribov, E. M. Levin and M. G. Ryskin, Phys. Rept. **100**, 1 (1983); A. H. Mueller and J-W. Qiu, Nucl. Phys. **268**, 427 (1986); A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. **B558**, 285 (1999).
 - [2] L. D. McLerran and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. **D49**, 2233 (1994); Phys. Rev. **D49**, *ibid.* **49**, 3352 (1994); *ibid.* **50**, 2225 (1994).
 - [3] D. Boer, M. Diehl, R. Milner, R. Venugopalan, W. Vogelsang, D. Kaplan, H. Montgomery and S. Vigdor *et al.*, arXiv:1108.1713; A. Accardi *et al.*, arXiv:1212.1701.
 - [4] J. L. Abelleira Fernandez *et al.* [LHeC Study Group Collaboration], J. Phys. **G39**, 075001 (2012) [arXiv:1206.2913].
 - [5] J. Jalilian-Marian, A. Kovner, A. Leonidov and H. Weigert, Nucl. Phys. **B504**, 415 (1997); *ibid.*, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 014014 (1999); E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. D. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. **A692**, 583 (2001); E. Ferreiro, E. Iancu, A. Leonidov and L. D. McLerran, Nucl. Phys. **A703**, 489 (2002).
 - [6] I. Balitsky, Nucl. Phys. **B463**, 99 (1996); Y. V. Kovchegov, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 034008 (1999); Phys. Rev. **D61**, 074018 (2000).
 - [7] I. Balitsky and G. A. Chirilli, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 014019 (2008) [arXiv:0710.4330].
 - [8] A. Kovner, M. Lublinsky and Y. Mulian, arXiv:1310.0378.
 - [9] J. L. Albacete, N. Armesto, J. G. Milhano, P. Quiroga Arias and C. A. Salgado, Eur. Phys. J. **C71**, 1705 (2011) [arXiv:1012.4408].
 - [10] A. H. Rezaeian, M. Siddikov, M. Van de Klundert and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 034002 (2013) [arXiv:1212.2974].
 - [11] A. H. Rezaeian and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 074016 (2013) [arXiv:1307.0825].
 - [12] H. Kowalski and D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. **D68**, 114005 (2003) [hep-ph/0304189].
 - [13] H. Kowalski, L. Motyka and G. Watt, Phys. Rev. **D74**, 074016 (2006) [hep-ph/0606272].
 - [14] G. Watt and H. Kowalski, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 014016 (2008).
 - [15] H. Kowalski, T. Lappi and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 022303 (2008) [arXiv:0705.3047]; H. Kowalski, T. Lappi, C. Marquet and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. **C78**, 045201 (2008) [arXiv:0805.4071].
 - [16] E. Levin and A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 014022 (2010) [arXiv:1005.0631]; arXiv:1011.3591.
 - [17] J. L. Albacete and A. Dumitru, arXiv:1011.5161.
 - [18] E. Levin and A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 054003 (2010) [arXiv:1007.2430]; Phys. Rev. **D83**, 114001 (2011) [arXiv:1102.2385]; A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 014028 (2012) [arXiv:1111.2312].
 - [19] A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Lett. **B727**, 218 (2013) [arXiv:1308.4736].
 - [20] B. Schenke, P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 252301 (2012) [arXiv:1202.6646]; B. Schenke, P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. **C86**, 034908 (2012); A. Bzdak, B. Schenke, P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, arXiv:1304.3403.
 - [21] J. L. Albacete *et al.*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E22**, 1330007 (2013) [arXiv:1301.3395].
 - [22] P. Tribedy and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Lett. **B710**, 125 (2012) [arXiv:1112.2445].
 - [23] J. L. Albacete, A. Dumitru, H. Fujii and Y. Nara, Nucl. Phys. **A897**, 1 (2013) [arXiv:1209.2001].
 - [24] A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Lett. **B718**, 1058 (2013) [arXiv:1210.2385].
 - [25] T. Lappi and H. Mantysaari, Phys. Rev. **D88**, 114020 (2013) [arXiv:1309.6963].
 - [26] J. Jalilian-Marian and A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 014017 (2012) [arXiv:1110.2810].

- [27] A. M. Stasto, B.-W. Xiao and D. Zaslavsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 012302 (2014) [arXiv:1307.4057].
- [28] J. Jalilian-Marian and A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 034016 (2012) [arXiv:1204.1319].
- [29] A. H. Rezaeian, Phys. Rev. **D86**, 094016 (2012) [arXiv:1209.0478].
- [30] J. L. Albacete and C. Marquet, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 162301 (2010) [arXiv:1005.4065]; T. Lappi and H. Mantysaari, Nucl. Phys. **A908** (2013) [arXiv:1209.2853].
- [31] J. L. Albacete and C. Marquet, arXiv:1401.4866.
- [32] Y. V. Kovchegov and E. Levin, Nucl. Phys. **B577**, 221 (2000).
- [33] S. Munier, A. M. Stasto and A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. **B603**, 427 (2001).
- [34] K. Golec-Biernat and J. Kwiecinski, Phys. Lett. **B353**, 329 (1995); K. Golec-Biernat and M. Wusthoff, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 114023 (1999).
- [35] S. J. Brodsky, L. Frankfurt, J. F. Gunion, A. H. Mueller, M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. **D50**, 3134 (1994); M. G. Ryskin, Z. Phys. **C57**, 89 (1993); G. Bertsch, S. J. Brodsky, A. S. Goldhaber, J. F. Gunion, Phys. Rev. Lett. **47**, 297 (1981).
- [36] I. P. Ivanov, N. N. Nikolaev and A. A. Savin, Phys. Part. Nucl. **37**, 1 (2006).
- [37] K. Goulianos, Phys. Rept. **101**, 169 (1983).
- [38] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb collaboration], J. Phys. **G40**, 045001 (2013) [arXiv:1301.7084].
- [39] C. Alexa *et al.* [H1 Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. **C73**, 2466 (2013) [arXiv:1304.5162].
- [40] F. D. Aaron *et al.* [H1 and ZEUS Collaboration], JHEP **1001**, 109 (2010) [arXiv:0911.0884].
- [41] H. Abramowicz *et al.* [H1 and ZEUS Collaborations], arXiv:1211.1182.
- [42] L. Motyka and G. Watt, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 014023 (2008).
- [43] J. Bartels, K. Golec-Biernat and K. Peters, Acta Phys. Polon. **B34**, 3051 (2003).
- [44] J. Nemchik, N. N. Nikolaev and B. G. Zakharov, Phys. Lett. **B341**, 228 (1994); J. Nemchik, N. N. Nikolaev, E. Predazzi and B. G. Zakharov, Z. Phys. **C75**, 71 (1997); J. R. Forshaw, R. Sandapen and G. Shaw, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 094013 (2004).
- [45] A. G. Shuvaev, K. J. Golec-Biernat, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 014015 (1999).
- [46] A. D. Martin, M. G. Ryskin and T. Teubner, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 014022 (2000).
- [47] A. H. Rezaeian, M. Siddikov, M. Van de Klundert and R. Venugopalan, arXiv:1307.0165.
- [48] A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. **B437**, 107 (1995).
- [49] A. Kovner and U. A. Wiedemann, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 051502 (2002) [hep-ph/0112140]; Phys. Lett. **B551**, 311 (2003) [hep-ph/0207335].
- [50] K. Golec-Biernat and A. M. Stasto, Nucl. Phys. **B668**, 345 (2003) [hep-ph/0306279]; J. Berger and A. Stasto, Phys. Rev. **D83**, 034015 (2011); JHEP **01**, 001 (2013).
- [51] E. Iancu, K. Itakura and S. Munier, Phys. Lett. **B590**, 199 (2004) [hep-ph/0310338].
- [52] E. Levin and K. Tuchin, Nucl. Phys. **B573**, 833 (2000), [hep-ph/9908317].
- [53] M. Alvioli, G. Soyez and D. N. Triantafyllopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 014016 (2013).
- [54] M. E. Binkley *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 73 (1982); B. H. Denby *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52** 795 (1984).
- [55] S. Chekanov *et al.* [ZEUS Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. **C24**, 345 (2002) [hep-ex/0201043].
- [56] S. Chekanov *et al.* [ZEUS Collaboration], Nucl. Phys. **B695**, 3 (2004) [hep-ex/0404008].
- [57] A. Aktas *et al.* [H1 Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. **C46**, 585 (2006) [hep-ex/0510016].
- [58] A. D. Martin *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B662**, 252 (2008) [arXiv:0709.4406].
- [59] L. Frankfurt, V. Guzey and M. Strikman, Phys. Rept. **512**, 255 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2091].
- [60] A. Caldwell and H. Kowalski, Phys. Rev. **C81**, 025203 (2010).
- [61] T. Lappi and H. Mantysaari, Phys. Rev. **C83**, 065202 (2011) [arXiv:1011.1988].
- [62] G. Antchev *et al.* [TOTEM Collaboration], Europhys. Lett. **95** 41001 (2011); **101**, 21002 (2013); Phys. Rev. Lett. **111** 1, 012001 (2013).
- [63] E. Nagy *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B150**, 221 (1979); N. Kwak *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B58**, 233 (1975); A. Breakstone *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B248** 253 (1984).
- [64] I. M. Dremin, arXiv:1206.5474.
- [65] A. Donnachie and P. V. Landshoff, Phys. Lett. **B123**, 345 (1983).
- [66] P. Brogueira and J. D. de Deus, J. Phys. G **39**, 055006 (2012) [arXiv:1105.1315].